1	AARON D. FORD	
2	Attorney General D. Randall Gilmer (Bar No. 14001) Chief Deputy Attorney General Ian Carr (Bar No. 13840)	
3		
4	Deputy Attorney General State of Nevada	
5	Office of the Attorney General 555 E. Washington Ave., Ste. 3900 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 Telephone: (702) 486-3427	
6		
7	Facsimile: (702) 486-3773 Email: DGilmer@ag.nv.gov	
8	Email: ICarr@ag.nv.gov	
9	Attorneys for Defendants Daniels, Wickham, Gittere, Reubart, Drummond,	
10	Minev, Green, and Fox (NDOC Defendants)	
11		
12	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
13	DISTRICT OF NEVADA	
14	ZANE M. FLOYD,	Case No. 3:21-cv-00176-RFB-CLB
	Plaintiff,	
15	v.	NDOC DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO STRIKE FUGITIVE DOCUMENTS
16	CHARLES DANIELS, DIRECTOR, NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF	FILED BY PLAINTIFF AT ECF Nos. 201, 202
17	CORRECTIONS, ET AL.,	,
18	Defendants.	
19		
20	Defendants Charles Daniels, Harold Wickham, William Gittere, William Reubart	
21	David Drummond, Dr. Michael Minev, Dr. David Green, and Linda Fox (collectively	
22	"NDOC Defendants"), by and through counsel, Aaron D. Ford, Attorney General for the	
23	State of Nevada, D. Randall Gilmer, Chief Deputy Attorney General, and Ian Carr, Deput	
24	Attorney General, hereby request the Court, pursuant to LR IC 7-1 strike Plaintiff	
25	Memorandum regarding deliberative process privilege as applied to upcoming deposition of	
26	NDOC Director Charles Daniels on Monday, October 4, 2021 (ECF No. 201) ("Memo") an	
27	its supporting exhibits (ECF No. 202), because the documents do not constitute a valid	
28		

motion or request for relief. This Motion to Strike is based on the following Memorandum of Points and Authorities and all papers and pleadings on file in this action.

### MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

#### I. INTRODUCTION

On September 30, 2021, Plaintiff filed his Memo (ECF No. 201) describing what privilege objections he expects to encounter during the deposition of Director Daniels scheduled for Monday, October 4, 2021. Plaintiff fails to articulate his Memo as a motion, stipulation, or notice, or otherwise request any cognizable form of relief from the Court. *Id.* at 9–10. Plaintiff gratuitously supplied two deposition transcripts under seal, in their entirety, as exhibits. ECF No. 202.

### II. LEGAL STANDARD / ARGUMENT

Rule 7 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure provides that a "request for a court order must be made by motion" and must: "(A) be in writing unless made during a hearing or trial; (B) state with particularity the grounds for seeking the order; and (C) state the relief sought." FED. R. CIV. P. 7(b). The Local Rules of Practice forbid "case-related correspondence," and further command that "[a]ll communications with the court *must be styled as a motion, stipulation, or notice.*" LR IA 7-1(b) (emphasis added). This Court is empowered to strike any improperly filed document from its docket. LR IC 7-1; LR IA 7-1(b).1

The Could should strike Plaintiff's Memo because it violates the Local Rules of Practice by presenting a legal position as to the propriety of certain privilege objections without seeking any specific relief. As such, the Memo is unsanctioned "case-related

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> See also Ready Transp., Inc. v. AAR Mfg., Inc., 627 F.3d 402, 404 (9th Cir. 2010) (holding that a district court has the inherent power to strike an improperly filed confidential document) (quoting Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry. v. Hercules, Inc., 146 F.3d 1071, 1074 (9th Cir. 1998)); Lazy Y Ranch Ltd. v. Behrens, 546 F.3d 580, 586–87, 588 (9th Cir. 2008); Hernandez v. City of El Monte, 138 F.3d 393, 398 (9th Cir. 1998); Adobe Sys. Inc. v. Christenson, 891 F. Supp. 2d 1194, 1201 (D. Nev. 2012) (authority to strike unsanctioned documents is essential to the court's ability to enforce its orders, manage its docket, and regulate insubordinate conduct).

## Case 3:21-cv-00176-RFB-CLB Document 205 Filed 10/01/21 Page 3 of 4

correspondence" under a plain reading of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and Local Rules of Practice. The Memo sets forth legal arguments that are unripe and speculative as to when Plaintiff anticipates encountering objections (and in response to what lines of questioning), and it offers no context, no frame of reference, and no legal or factual basis for the Court to rule upon any ripe evidentiary issues. Furthermore, the Memo requests no known or cognizable form of relief from the Court. Therefore, the Memo constitutes case correspondence, and is barred by the Local Rules of Practice. The Memo and its supporting exhibits are fugitive documents filed in violation of the Local Rules of Practice and must be stricken from the record.

To the extent the Court contemplates the nature of any objections that may arise during the Monday, October 4, 2021 deposition of Director Daniels, NDOC Defendants have maintained since this case's inception that the deliberative process privilege and potentially other privileges apply to certain information Plaintiff has attempted to discover in this case. See e.g., ECF No. 40 at 28:1–5; ECF No. 49 at 11–12; ECF No. 76; ECF No. 96 at 36:16–23; ECF No. 113 at 5:21–25; ECF No. 143; ECF No. 174 at 50–51. NDOC Defendants will assert and argue privilege issues at the proper time and in the proper context when the issues actually materialize.

18 ||///

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19 ||///

20 ||///

21 ||///

22 || / / /

23 ||///

24 ||///

25 ||///

26 ||///

27 ||///

28 ||///

# III. CONCLUSION

Plaintiff's Memo attempts to argue against a privilege objection in a surreptitious, speculative, and unripe manner to poison further discourse as to its potential application. The Court should strike Plaintiff's Memo (ECF No. 201) and its exhibits (ECF No. 202) in observance of the Local Rules of Practice. For these reasons and those set forth above, NDOC Defendants respectfully request the Court grant their Motion to Strike Fugitive Documents Filed by Plaintiff at ECF Nos. 201, 202.

Respectfully submitted on this 1st day of October, 2021, by:

AARON D. FORD Attorney General

By: /s/ D. Randall Gilmer

D. Randall Gilmer (Bar No. 14001)
Chief Deputy Attorney General
Ian Carr (Bar No. 13840)
Deputy Attorney General
Attorneys for NDOC Defendants